

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2 and 7 are pending.

In Paragraph No. 9 of the Action, claims 1, 2 and 7 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly being unpatentable over claims 1, 3, 4 and 6-10 of U.S. Patent No. 7,014,308.

In Paragraph No. 10 of the Action, claims 1, 2 and 7 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly being unpatentable over claims 1 and 3-5 of U.S. Patent No. 7,083,668.

In Paragraph No. 11 of the Action, claims 1, 2 and 7 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly being unpatentable over claims 1, 2 and 4-8 of U.S. Patent No. 7,037,365.

In Paragraph No. 12 of the Action, claims 1, 2 and 7 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly being unpatentable over claims 1 and 9-13 of U.S. Patent No. 7,077,894.

In Paragraph No. 13 of the Action, claims 1, 2 and 7 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly being unpatentable over claims 1-3, 5 and 10-12 of U.S. Patent No. 6,874, 882.

In Paragraph No. 14 of the Action, claims 1, 2 and 7 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly being unpatentable over claims 1, 3-5 and 7-9 of copending Application No. 10/508,792 (U.S. 2005/0174409).

In Paragraph No. 15 of the Action, claims 1, 2 and 7 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly being unpatentable over claims 1, 2 and 4-6 of copending Application No. 10/808,464 (U.S. 2004/0187736).

In Paragraph No. 16 of the Action, claims 1, 2 and 7 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly being unpatentable over claims 13-15 of copending Application No. 11/360, 611 (U.S. 2005/0174409).

In Paragraph No. 17 of the Action, claims 1, 2 and 7 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly being unpatentable over claims 1, 8-10, 13, 15, 20, 21 and 24 of copending Application No. 10/503,894 (U.S. 2005/0178288).

In Paragraph No. 18 of the Action, claims 1, 2 and 7 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly being unpatentable over claims 1, 6 and 7 of copending Application No. 10/806,453 (U.S. 2004/0187734).

In response, Applicants submit herewith Terminal Disclaimers to overcome these obviousness-type double patenting rejections. The disclaimers are numbered Nos. 1-10, in the same order as the rejections set forth above.

In view of Applicants' submission of these Terminal Disclaimers, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw all of the provisional and non-provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejections set forth above.

Allowance is respectfully requested.


RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. Appln. No.: 10/809,550

Atty. Docket No. Q80720

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Brett S. Sylvester
Registration No. 32,765

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON DC SUGHRUE/265550

65565

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: March 23, 2007